## STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

David H. Coburn 202.429.8063 dcoburn@steptoe.com

215771

1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036-1795 Tel 202.429.3000 Fax 202.429.3902 steptoe.com

February 8, 2006

The Honorable Vernon A. Williams Secretary Surface Transportation Board 1925 K Street, N.W., Room 711 Washington, DC 20423-0001 Office of Proceeding of Proceeding of Proceeding of Proceeding of Proceeding of Part o



Re:

Section 5a Application No. 46 (Sub No. 20), Southern Motor Carriers Rate

Conference, Inc.

Dear Secretary Williams:

Rocky Mountain Tariff Bureau, Inc. ("RMB") hereby responds to the January 27, 2006 letter from counsel for the Southern Motor Carriers Rate Conference, Inc. ("SMC") inquiring as to the timing of a Board decision in the above proceeding. In this proceeding, SMC seeks approval to expand the scope of its antitrust immunized ratemaking agreement so as to allow its member carriers to engage in collective ratemaking on a nationwide basis, rather than within the territory long defined in the SMC ratemaking agreement. RMB has opposed, and continues to oppose, SMC's application on the ground that SMC has failed to offer any reason why its immunity should be broadened, and because the public interest would be best served by retaining existing ratemaking territories.

RMB submits (as it argued at the oral hearing in this proceeding) that the Board's consideration of SMC's nationwide ratemaking proposal should await the completion of the Board's on-going review of the agreements of each of the rate bureaus, including SMC's, in Ex Parte No. 656, *Motor Carrier Rate Bureaus -- Periodic Review Proceeding* (served December 13, 2004). Any determinations that the Board makes in that review proceeding could conceivably have a bearing on SMC's nationwide ratemaking application, thereby making it more logical to first complete that review proceeding.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> RMB also notes that by decision served October 13, 2005, the Board initiated a separate investigation of certain practices of the National Classification Committee relative to the renewal of its antitrust immunity. See Ex Parte No. 656 (Sub No. 1), Investigation into the Practices of the National Classification Committee.

Honorable Vernon A. Williams February 8, 2006 Page 2

Finally, RMB notes that SMC is the only rate bureau actively seeking an expansion in the scope of its antitrust immunity, and that its request is opposed by the National Industrial Transportation League and the U.S. Department of Transportation. While SMC has sought the amendment of its ratemaking agreement for many years, and claims that this proceeding is of critical importance to its members, the fact is that the motor carrier industry remains highly competitive and that no carrier (including any SMC member carrier) is constrained from offering a competitive rate for any traffic it may seek to transport between any two points in the United States. Thus, the Board should be cautious in expanding antitrust immunity and changing a status quo in which the public interest is being served.

Respectfully,

David H. Coburn

Jul 4c

Attorney for Rocky Mountain Tariff Bureau, Inc.

cc: All parties of record